

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,561,030 to Holdcroft et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,766,515 to Jonas et al. and U.S. Patent 4,477,963 to Cogan. In particular, the examiner asserts that all of the references in combination teach a relief structure comprising the claimed electrically conductive polymer, the claimed process for formation of electrically conductive polymeric patterns, and the claimed arrangement of polymeric patterns.

Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claims 1 and 9 recite limitations which are not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

In particular, claim 1 recites a relief structure that "comprises a plurality of tracks, which are spaced apart to form channels of semiconductor material, said channels having a length of 10  $\mu\text{m}$  or less." This recitation finds support from the specification at page 3, line 34 continuing to page 4, lines 1-2. The advantage of a channel length of 10  $\mu\text{m}$  or less is described in the specification at page 4, lines 9-13. Although Cogan '963 teaches gate and source widths and depths, and distances between a gate and a source, it fails to teach or suggest a channel length between tracks. None of the other references teach or suggest a channel length between tracks. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be non-obvious.

Claims 2 and 4-8 depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore believed to be patentable for the same reasons as discussed above. Additionally, claim 4 recites drain and source electrodes which is distinguishable from the gate and source electrodes described in the '963 patent.

Claim 9 recites an additional step of filtrating the radiation-sensitive composition that is to be used to form the electrically conductive relief structure in the desired pattern. As stated in the specification at page 7, lines 17-19, "filtration prevents the eventual presence of particles larger than the widths of the tracks formed." None of the cited references teach filtration to prevent the presence of foreign particles. Therefore, new independent claim 9 is believed to be non-obvious from the references cited. Dependent claims 10-11 are therefore believed to be patentable as well.


Finally, the examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,319,491 to Selbrede in view of U.S. Patent 5,766,515 to Jonas et al. The examiner states that "Selbrede teaches a optical display device comprising a matrix of pixels" and that "each pixel comprises light guidance substrate, an elastomer layer, and a pair of interdigitated electrodes spaced 1 micron apart." Yet, Selbrede '491 fails to teach "a plurality of tracks, which are spaced apart to form channels of semiconductor material, said channels having a length of at a distance of 10  $\mu\text{m}$  or less" as recited in new independent claim 1. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that new claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 4-8 are non-obvious and patentable.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain which may be resolved by telephonic communication, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, if such will advance the application to allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ian Glickberg  
Reg. No. 51,742  
Agent for Applicants  
(845) 359-7700

Dated: December 8, 2003

**NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.**  
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110  
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

**Customer No. 21706**

F:\TEXT\PATAMD\J741-008.wpd